UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/533,290	02/07/2006	Thor Las Holtet	08-349-WO-US	6045
	7590 05/01/200 BOEHNEN HULBER	EXAMINER		
300 S. WACKER DRIVE			MERTZ, PREMA MARIA	
32ND FLOOR CHICAGO, IL	60606		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1646	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/01/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/533,290	HOLTET ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	Prema M. Mertz	1646	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>13 April 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
<ul> <li>a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date</li> <li>b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Armone event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire lateral expired to the statutory period for reply expired t</li></ul>	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	n.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	). on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	36(a) and the appropriat of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	e extension fee ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
NOTICE OF APPEAL			
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. ☑ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	Called
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause
(c) They have the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	•	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c		ected claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1 <sup>-1</sup> 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	,	mpliant Amandment (	DTOL 224)
<ol> <li>The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ol>		inpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected: 1,18-23,30 and 35.  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Prema Mertz/ Primary Examiner		

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Amended claim 1 recites "....a first portion of each monomer specifically binds a trimeric cytokine and a second portion of each monomer....." which is new matter in the claim and precipitates a new 35 USC 112, first paragraph, new matter rejection because there is no basis for this limitation in the specification.

Furthermore, the rejection of claims 1, 18-23, 30, and 35 under the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is maintained because Applicants have not shown that the specification contains a written description sufficient to show they had possession of the full scope of their claimed invention at the time the application was filed.

The rejection of claims 1, 18-23, 30, and 35 under the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is maintained because Applicants have failed to disclose a correlation between the protion of the monomer that binds a trimeric cytokine and the structure responsible for binding to the cytokine such that one of skill in the art would have known what constructs encoding trimeric polypeptides could be made of the very large number possible and encompassed by the scope of claim 1 without losing function.

The provisional rejection of claims 1, 18-20, and 30 for obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 56-68 of U.S. Application No. 11/452,434 (the '434 application). Applicants argue that because the obviousness-type double patenting rejection is provisional, Applicants elect to address this ground of rejection by submitting a Terminal Disclaimer or by argument upon notification that this rejection has been made non-provisional, all other conditions for patentability have been met, and the instant claims are otherwise in condition for allowance. However, the claims will never be allowable until a terminal disclaimer over the co-pending application is filed